



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VIII. — *Horace on the Nature of Satire*

BY PROFESSOR B. L. ULLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

HORACE's fourth Satire deals with the purpose, style, publication, and especially the methods of satire. On all of these matters Horace makes himself clear except on the last, the methods of satire. His failure to do so is, I think, deliberate, and is the reason for the current confusion in the interpretation of the poem. To clear away this confusion is the bold undertaking of this paper.

Horace begins by describing the writers of the Old Greek Comedy: they branded with great freedom the individual bad man, thief, libertine, murderer; Lucilius is, in the first place, closely dependent on them, secondly, he is witty and keen, but, thirdly, he is harsh in composition. The chief topic of the satire is indicated in these first lines and specifically in the words: *Si quis erat dignus describi . . . multa cum libertate notabant*. Horace began in this way with the evident intention of characterizing his own attitude. The important matter after all was not what the Old Comedy or even Lucilius had done, but what Horace was doing and was going to do. We must therefore look for a revelation of Horace's attitude towards the characteristic of the Old Comedy indicated in these lines. But here we encounter a difficulty. What is meant by the words just quoted, and in what respect, therefore, is Lucilius dependent on the Old Comedy? Primarily, the Old Comedy and Lucilius satirized living individuals indiscriminately — "rich man, poor man, beggarman, thief," and secondarily, they said just what they wanted to say.¹ In substantiation of the first point, we may note the form of expression, *si quis erat dignus describi*, which is far more emphatic than *dignos describi* would be. Then we may cite the authority of a number of the editors, *e.g.* Kiessling-Heinze,

¹ *Libertas*, like English 'freedom' and similar words, includes both the manner and the person concerned — 'telling *everything* about *everybody*.' Thus it reinforces the primary thought of the passage besides giving the secondary.

by whom the satirizing by name characteristic of the Old Comedy is contrasted with the 'enigmatic' or allusive style of the Middle Comedy, and Lejay, whose comment is: "sans égards pour le rang ou pour la fortune." It is this characteristic of Lucilius which Horace mentions in *Serm.* II, I, 69:

Primores populi arripuit populumque tributim.

As regards the second point, the meaning of *multa cum libertate*, we must not be misled by Horace's remarks in the tenth Satire into believing that it was severity and bitterness of invective that was in his mind. *Libertas* has a good connotation in two similar passages. In *Epist.* II, I, 145 ff., the history of the satirical Fescennine verses is described: *Liber-tas . . . lusit amabiliter donec iam saevus apertam in rabiem coepit verti iocus et per honestas ire domos impune minax.*² In *A.P.* 281 ff., *successit vetus his comoedia non sine multa laude, sed in vitium libertas excidit et vim dignam lege regi, i.e.* liberty became license. Likewise in a good connotation are Quintilian's words about Lucilius (x, I, 94): *libertas atque inde acerbitas*; cf. III, 8, 48; x, I, 65; XI, I, 137; etc. Nor can it be argued that the use of *multa* with *libertate* makes a difference: much liberty is still liberty and not license. Furthermore, there can be no point in making Horace begin with an adverse criticism which he does not defend.

Lucilius' second quality, wit, is probably not intended to be included in his dependence on the Old Comedy, as the third quality, harsh verse composition, surely is not so included. We must not misinterpret *facetis*, 'witty.' It is not equivalent to *comis et urbanus* of I, IO, 65, as asserted by Kiessling-Heinze, and therefore does not mean that Lucilius is restrained and gentle in his wit; this would be quite inconsistent with Horace's attitude in the tenth Satire. Nor, on the other hand, does it refer to aggressive, bitter wit. As a matter of fact, Horace is not for the moment making any

² The two phases of *libertas* mentioned in the preceding note are clearly indicated here: the manner is described in the first clause (*saevus . . . iocus*) and the persons concerned in the second (*per . . . minax*).

distinction between different kinds of wit; he is paying Lucilius a compliment without reservation.³

The language describing Lucilius' freedom in attack and his wit is, therefore, at the worst, non-committal, at the best, laudatory, quite in contrast with the language concerning his composition, which is frankly condemnatory, and has to be justified in the passage that follows. In place of the discussion about Lucilius' composition, we should expect Horace to announce his own position in reference to the Old Comedy and Lucilius, but he sidesteps cleverly by means of the discussion of style.⁴ How well he has succeeded is shown by the fact that some editors think that Horace is classing himself with Lucilius and the Old Comedy, while others assert that he is disclaiming all connection with them!

The discussion of Lucilius' composition seems to be a bid for favor, as it implies that Horace is extremely careful in his own composition. At the same time he must have been confident that others felt as he did. The particular charge against Lucilius is the careless rapidity of his production — "200 verses an hour while standing on one foot," he humorously puts it. A contemporary poet comes in for the same criticism. This productivity is by implication explained as due to the desire to get a reputation through publication and recitation. A certain contemporary, Fannius, is the one who is charged with the desire for publicity, but the impression is left on the reader that Lucilius' verbosity is due to the same cause.⁵ Of Fannius, Horace says: *Beatus Fannius ultro delatis capsis et imagine*. To the many interpretations of this sentence I have a partially new one to add: Fannius is generous in giving away free copies, not of single *libelli* either, but of cases containing ten or a dozen books of a single (voluminous) work, expensive copies at that, illustrated

³ Horace himself states in *Serm.* 1, 10, 3-4 (and I think that his tongue is not in his cheek as he says it) that in the fourth Satire he had praised Lucilius for his wit.

⁴ For the reasons, see below, p. 128.

⁵ Horace no doubt had in mind the remark of Lucilius that he was writing not for Scipio and other learned men, but for more ordinary mortals (592 ff. *Marx.*). Horace, on the other hand, writes for the learned (*Serm.* 1, 10, 81 ff.).

with portrait of the author. Contrast with that Horace's meagre output and his reluctance to publish.⁶ In calling Fannius *beatus*, 'happy,' there is a play on the other meaning of *beatus*, 'prosperous,' since Fannius must be prosperous if he can afford such extravagant generosity.⁷ This interpretation is almost necessary for the contrast with the next words, that no one reads Horace's writing, and that he is even afraid to give (free) public recitations because some people do not like satire (*genus hoc*, vs. 24). Thus Horace comes to his starting point, the methods of satire, and in this indirect way partially states his attitude toward Lucilius and the Old Comedy in the matter of personal attack. Even if he does attack individuals as the Old Comedy and Lucilius do (he does not admit it), it makes no difference, for no one knows it. Some people do not like satire because they have weaknesses which attract the attention of the satirist (see below, p. 126). They charge the satirist with attacking even friends, provided he can get a laugh thereby, and with an itch for publicity. These people all hate poets. Thus Horace gives the *alleged* purpose of satire (making fun of people) and the *alleged* method (indiscriminate attack). Since the desire for publication is also mentioned and since the style of satire is hinted at in the word *poetas* and perhaps in *illevērit*, we have in these few words the four points at issue.

Horace in answer takes the last charge first and says that his verse and that of Lucilius is not poetry. His purpose is to indicate further the proper style of satire. It should be colloquial, like comedy. The discussion is aimed, not at contemporary admirers of Lucilius,⁸ but at those who hold that

⁶ For *ultra delatis*, cf. *Epist.* 1, 12, 22, *ultra defer*; also verses 36-38 of this satire, and, for the contrast with what follows, verses 71-73. In the essentials of my interpretation I find myself anticipated by Doederlein. His view is apparently not even quoted elsewhere.

⁷ As no royalty was paid to authors at this time (*A.P.* 345-346), Fannius would be out only the actual cost of producing the books.

⁸ So Hendrickson, *A.J.P.* XXI (1900), 129. Why does not Horace cite an example from Lucilius instead of from comedy? I do not think that there is any real evidence that the Lucilians disagreed with Horace on this point, though it is perhaps likely that their style was too poetic to suit his taste. In the tenth

comedy is poetry.⁹ The fact that the example which Horace represents the opposition as quoting is taken from the New Comedy and that the writers of the Old Comedy are called *poetae* in the first line of the satire has led some to say that Horace has only the New Comedy in mind here and that he considers the Old Comedy to be real poetry. There is no good ground for this belief. In 1, 4, 2, and 1, 10, 16, where Horace is speaking of the Old Comedy, he is careful to distinguish it by the term *comoedia prisca*, though in the first passage this is hardly necessary. Why, then, in the passage under discussion, should he say merely *comoedia* if he meant only the New Comedy and not comedy in general? As for the use of *poetae* in verse 1 in application to the writers of the Old Comedy, it is not probable that Horace was thinking of his rather quibbling distinction at the time — just as at the end of the satire (141) he humorously says: “We *poets* will force you into our point of view.”¹⁰ It is to be noted that in verse 1 the word *poetae* comes at the end of a verse full of proper names, including one of five syllables, and so was very likely thrown in to fill out a difficult line. Furthermore, let us remember that not even an ancient reader would see any special point in the application of the term *poetae* to Aristophanes and Eupolis, before he had read Horace’s discussion on the nature of comedy.

Again, Horace could hardly have said so emphatically that Lucilius was entirely dependent on the Old Comedy (hinc

Satire, where Horace returns to the question of style on account of the outcry raised over his criticism of Lucilius, nothing is said about the classification of satire as poetry, in spite of the fact that he had promised in the fourth Satire to return to the subject.

⁹ The discussion is mentioned in Cicero, *Or.* 67: Visum esse nonnullis Platonis . . . locutionem . . . potius poema putandum quam comicorum poetarum, apud quos, nisi quod versiculi sunt, nihil est aliud cotidiani dissimile sermonis. For Greek examples, see Kroll’s note on this passage. The last part of Cicero’s sentence is strikingly like Horace’s verses 47-48: nisi quod pede certo differt sermoni, sermo merus. Cf. too *Or.* 183-184 with Horace’s verses 56-62.

¹⁰ Oesterlen, *Karik und Humor bei Horaz*, 1, 28, thinks the inconsistency deliberate for humorous effect. Cartault, *Les Satires d’Horace*, 124, thinks that Horace is deliberately showing his disdain for strict logic. Horace calls the writer of comedies a poet in *Epist.* 11, 1, 182.

omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque) if he had been thinking at the very moment that the Old Comedy was poetry and that Lucilius' satire was not. That the mere change of meter introduced by Lucilius could make his work unpoetic is denied by Horace himself in verses 60 f.

Finally, the words of Cicero quoted on page 115, note 9, refer to all comedy, as do those of Strabo and the Scholiast on Hephaestion, quoted by Kroll in his note on the Ciceronian passage. Only one Greek passage (*de Comoedia Graeca*, II, 12 Kaibel, p. 8) comments on the lack of poetic diction (nothing is said of spirit) in the Middle Comedy as contrasted with the Old Comedy.¹¹

Some new light can, I think, be shed on the source of Horace's doctrine. In the tenth Satire he makes a passing allusion to the doctrine when he repeats his criticism of Lucilius in the opening words and says that wit is not everything in verse composition; if it were, we should have to admit that even the mimes of the very witty Laberius are good comedy (to which type satire belongs), nay more, even that they are the finest of genuine poetry, comparable to an epic; but that question was left *sub iudice*.¹²

This passage serves as a bridge between the fourth Satire and two fragments of Philodemus' *περὶ Ποιημάτων*, 72 and 73 Hausrath. Writing as a contemporary of Laberius, Philodemus attacks the view of those who regard Demosthenes, Antiphon, Herodotus, and Sophron the mimographer, as poets.

¹¹ Hendrickson, *A.J.P.* XXI (1900), 130, n. 2, quotes Bernays, "Ergänzung zur Aristoteles Poetik" (*Rh. Mus.* VIII, 581) for Aristotle's supposedly similar view. This rests on an utter misapprehension. Bernays speaks of the "phantastisch, gaukelnden Stil," 'the fantastic, tricky style,' of the Old Comedy—not 'high-flown, poetical language,' as Hendrickson translates—and shows why Aristotle preferred the New Comedy. The *Poetics* indicate clearly that Aristotle would consider the New Comedy better poetry than the Old. He makes *μίμησις* the basis of genuine poetry and for this reason would refuse Empedocles the name of poet (1447 b 19). In fact, on the interpretation of *οἱ λεγόμενοι ποιηταί* (1449 b 4) as 'so-called poets' (which I prefer on other grounds) the Old Comedy is categorically denied classification as poetry.

¹² Nam sic et Laberi mimos ut pulchra poemata mirer. This interpretation is, I believe, new.

It would seem as if Horace took this remark of Philodemus and gave it a Roman application.¹³ This is likely enough, seeing that he probably knew Philodemus personally, quotes him by name in *Serm.* I, 2, 121, and probably imitates him in verse 92 of the same satire.¹⁴

After this discussion, Horace returns to the suspicious attitude of some persons toward satire (*genus hoc scribendi*, 65; cf. *genus hoc*, 24) and makes his own point of view a little clearer. Sulcius and Caprius are a terror to robbers (*latronibus*), says Horace, but good people have nothing to fear from them; besides Horace is not like them. The word *latronibus* carries one back in thought to the beginning of the satire, where the Old Comedy and Lucilius are said to attack thieves. Only in this allusive manner does Horace make his attitude toward Lucilius a little clearer, but not so very much after all, as we shall see in a moment.¹⁵ The scholiasts, followed by the editors, say that Sulcius and Caprius were informers. They are described as *rauci male cumque libellis*, hoarse from making many charges in court, and carrying in their hands their indictments or note-books for gathering evidence. But another interpretation occurs to me, one in which I find myself anticipated in part by the Commentator Cruquianus (quoted by Schütz with disfavor).¹⁶ Sulcius and Caprius are contemporary satirists, hoarse from much reciting of their (long-winded) poems,¹⁷ and carrying about

¹³ On the other hand, my interpretation of Horace's statement comes closer to the probable meaning of Aristotle's remark about Sophron, quoted by Athenaeus (XI, p. 505 c).

¹⁴ The fourth Satire was probably written soon after the second. Verse 92 is a repetition of I, 2, 27. On the Philodemus passage, see Sudhaus in *Herm.* XI, 1, 275. He argues from it that Sophron used prose only. Horace's remark about Laberius, which he does not quote, shows that his argument is inconclusive. For the close relation of Philodemus to the Augustan writers, see Körte's article, "Augusteer bei Philodem," in *Rh. Mus.* XLV (1890), 172. Körte suggests the possibility of restoring 'Opárie in one place.

¹⁵ For the relation of *latronum* to satire cf. II, 1, 42, on which see below.

¹⁶ The explanation is not Cruquius' own invention, as he does not mention it in his own comment. He got it from a manuscript or an earlier edition.

¹⁷ Cf. especially Juv. I, 2: *vexatus totiens rauci Theseide Cordi*. In a similar manner *lippus* is used of the voluminous Crispinus in I, 1, 120: he is bleary-eyed from writing too much.

copies of their books, very likely for free distribution.¹⁸ This interpretation seems to me preferable and really necessary for the following reasons. First, and most important, is the evidence of the words that follow. Horace says: "Suppose that you should be like Caelius and Birrius the robbers, I would not be like Caprius or Sulcius; why should you fear me? No bookshop would have my books for sale; besides I don't recite, except to friends by request." Surely Horace implies that Caprius and Sulcius put their books on sale, which would be absurd if these were indictments or note-books. It is most natural to suppose that the *libellis* of verse 66 are of the same kind as the *libellos* in verse 71.¹⁹ Some editors think that the similarity between Horace and the informers consists in the fact that they both published. But this is treating Horace's language too freely, I think. Other editors think that the mention of the bookshop in verse 71 has nothing to do with the preceding, and so they indicate a paragraph division at this point. But even the syntax shows that the two parts belong together, for the subjunctives *sim* and *habeat* are the conclusions to the supposition of the preceding line. The fact that the two verbs are separated by *cur metuas me* has led to this misinterpretation, according to which it is not made clear in what respect Horace is unlike Sulcius and Caprius. It has been supposed that it is in respect to personal attack. This would be highly important if true. It has been said above that a very slight clue to Horace's attitude toward personal attack in this passage is the possible suggestion conveyed by the word *latronum*. For Horace to say much more at this point would be inconsistent with the satire as a whole. There is, however, a further negative indication of Horace's attitude in the statement that good people need not fear even Sulcius and Caprius — much less need they fear him. Thus Horace perhaps implies that personal attack may be justifiable. Some of those who hold the view that Horace is here disclaiming any resemblance to public accusers make matters

¹⁸ As in verses 21–22; see above, p. 113.

¹⁹ As *cum libellis* is contrasted with verses 71–72, so *rauci male* is contrasted with verses 73–74.

worse by assuming that in the beginning of the satire Horace implies his dependence on Lucilius in the matter of personal attack.

In the second place, the suggestion that Sulcius and Caprius are satirists is favored by comparison with verses 14 ff. As Horace turns in that passage from Lucilius to two contemporary poets, Crispinus and Fannius, with their love for notoriety, so here he turns to the two poets, Sulcius and Caprius, who are addicted to the same weakness. Furthermore, the association of recitation and publication brought out by our interpretation is familiar from verses 22-23. Finally, the interpretation of the scholia is of no weight because it could easily have been made from Horace's own words. As Lejay remarks, it smacks of the language of the Empire. A reader of Juvenal would be particularly apt to think of delators.²⁰

So this passage (65-78) really only answers decisively the charge that all satirists, Horace included, have a desire for publication (37). The charge had already been answered by anticipation in verses 21-23. Hence it may be seen that Horace protests very clearly and emphatically against classification with other satirists in this respect.²¹

It is remarked by Kiessling-Heinze that one would expect Horace to say that his attacks are harmless and not to be feared. This remark of course proceeds from the assumption that Sulcius and Caprius are prosecutors, not satirists, but it is still true that as we read verses 64-65,

Nunc illud tantum quaeram meritone tibi sit
Suspectum genus hoc scribendi,

we expect a statement of Horace's position as to personal attack. But again he is as cleverly evasive as he was in verses 9 ff.

The other charge made in verses 34-35 was, then, this one

²⁰ On this interpretation the epithet *acer*, applied to Sulcius in verse 65, has the same meaning as in II, I, 1, *Sunt quibus in satura videar nimis acer*, and in I, IO, 14.

²¹ Horace comes back to this point in the tenth Satire. There is a passing allusion to it in verses 38-39, but prominence is given it in verses 74 ff. As in the fourth Satire, the itch for publication is associated with a poor style.

of indiscriminate personal attack (the method of satire) to create laughter (the purpose of satire). This charge is now amplified in verses 78 ff., which, with their reply, constitute the climax of the poem. Horace cleverly keeps us in the dark till he is ready for this climax, which must be carefully worded to avoid committing the author too far. *Laedere gaudes, et hoc studio pravus facis*, says the opponent. Horace starts to answer,²² but the opponent continues with his indictment, elaborating the idea of *laedere*. Of the five charges made, the first two, that of attacking one who is absent and of failing to defend a person when another finds fault,²³ are suggested by Horace's attempted defense, made immediately before (80-81), that no one of the persons with whom he has been associated (*vixi cum*) would make a charge of *laedere* against him.²⁴ The two charges are contrasting phases of the same thought. The third charge, of trying to make people laugh,²⁵ is either a general one that covers all the other four, or, as is more likely, is expanded by the fourth and fifth,²⁶ of making up untruths and of divulging secrets (for everything is grist in the joker's mill). In any case the last two charges together have to do with unscrupulous fun-making.

The structure of the sentence confirms the analysis we have just made. The five charges are made in five *qui*-clauses, each preceded by a word (in one case two words) taken out of its clause. In the first two clauses the words are *absentem* and *amicum*, which may well be taken together

²² The form of the reply implies that other satirists are guilty of this charge.

²³ Thus *amicum* repeats *amico* of verse 35.

²⁴ In I, 10, 79-80, *laedere* is associated closely with attacking an absent person. In verse 80 it is said that Fannius Hermogenis laedat conviva Tigelli (for *conviva* cf. *vixi cum* in I, 4, 81). In verse 79 we find *vellicet absentem* Demetrius (for *vellicet* cf. *rodit* in I, 4, 81; in I, 3, 21 we find *Maenius absentem* Novium cum carperet; all three of these verbs are associated in Cic. *Balb.* 57). The words of Quintilian are illuminating (VI, 3, 28): *laedere* numquam velimus, longeque absit propositum illud: potius *amicum* quam dictum perdidit. For *laedere* cf. II, 1, 67 (of Lucilius) and see also below, pp. 123 ff. For its use in the sense of personal attack cf. *laesio* in Cic. *de Or.* III, 205 and Wilkins' note.

²⁵ This reiterates the charge in verses 34-35.

²⁶ So Kiessling-Heinze.

as belonging to both clauses,²⁷ in the third clause *solutos* modifies a noun in its clause and has no relation to the other clauses, in the fourth and fifth clauses two infinitives precede and their objects are neuter participles (*ingere non visa* and *commissa tacere*), while the verbs are opposites (*potest* and *nequit*). Evidently the first two clauses belong together, as do the last two.

In replying to the charges, Horace does not directly deny them or throw the onus for them on other satirists. Instead he says that there are persons who are guilty of these deeds but are not criticized for them. In his answer Horace takes up the two groups of charges, the one of doing injury, the other of making fun, in inverse order.²⁸ His first words involve an obscurity that has never been cleared up. One may often see at a dinner party, says Horace, four persons on each of the three couches, and one of these persons likes to spray every one with his wit, except the host; and even he is not spared when this guest becomes intoxicated.²⁹ Various explanations have been offered for mentioning the seating of four on a couch instead of the usual three, but candid editors admit the weakness of all of them. The passage is clarified by comparison with other passages. In his speech against Piso (67) Cicero describes the combination of luxury with meanness at Piso's house. There is a great deal of meat, but it is half-spoiled. Wine and bread have to be brought in from the shops. The cook acts as butler, etc.: "Greeks crowded together five on a couch, often more, while he sits alone." Who were these Greeks? They were the entertainers, the *comites Graeculi* whom Cicero calls *nugae* in *Mil.* 55. Again, in

²⁷ The two words would as inevitably be grouped together by the Roman reader as *absentem* and *amicam* in 1, 5, 15. The two clauses together are an expansion of *non parcat amico* of verse 35.

²⁸ Doederlein in his third edition of Heindorf (1859) fails to group the five charges and so has to say that Horace answers only the second and third (in inverse order).

²⁹ In verse 89, *condita cum verax aperit praecordia Liber*, there seems to be a pun on the meaning of *Liber* — the god who makes one speak *libere*. The pun is kept up in the next line, where the person affected is called *liber*, 'gentlemanly,' with the humorous suggestion of loquaciousness.

Epist. 1, 5, Horace invites his friend Torquatus to dinner, adding that there will be room for several *umbrae*, guests whom Torquatus might bring along without special invitation. But not too many, says Horace, for noisome goats (the *umbrae*) squeeze the guests together too closely (27). The *umbrae* had to be crowded in wherever possible. Now these *umbrae* were expected to entertain the company with their jests — they were *scurrae*. So in *Serm.* 11, 8, the two *umbrae* brought by Maecenas are evidently *scurrae* to amuse the company. Likewise in Plaut. *Stich.* 619, the parasite Gelasimus is to be squeezed in tightly (*arte*) at table. As his name indicates, his function is to be funny, *ridiculus*, as his name is translated in 176–177 and 637. His stock in trade, which he tries to sell at auction, consists of *logi ridiculi* (221, 455). In the fourth Satire, then, Horace is referring to the *umbrae*. There are three or more of these squeezed in on the couches, and at least one of them can be depended upon to be a *scurra* who will make fun of everybody. The *scurra* had once been a man to be admired for his urbane wit, but by Horace's time the type had degenerated, and Horace constantly speaks of it with more or less contempt.³⁰ The older type is described in Cat. 22 by the adjectives *dicax* and *urbanus*. In the passage of Horace under discussion (83) the charge is that the satirist strives for the reputation of a *dicax*, and in verse 90 Horace answers by saying that the *scurra* is looked upon as *comis et urbanus*.³¹ The old terms still persisted, though the type had changed.

Such *scurrae*, then, do the things charged against the satirists in verses 83–85, but they are praised, not criticized, for it. A comparison of the references to the *scurrae* elsewhere in Horace with this passage makes this quite clear. The fondness for drink of the *scurra* and the consequent loosening of the tongue are touched on again by Horace in *Serm.* 11, 8, 37 (cf. *Epist.* 1, 18, 38). One of the charges against Horace was

³⁰ *Serm.* 1, 5, 52; 1, 8, 11; 11, 3, 229; 11, 7, 15, 36; *Epist.* 1, 17, 19; 1, 18, 200; Kiessling-Heinze on *balatro*, *Serm.* 1, 2, 2. In *Epist.* 1, 15, 27, he speaks of Maenius as *urbanus scurra* — the older type — with whom he compares himself.

³¹ Cf. Sen. *Dial.* 11, 17, 3: *scurram venustum ac dicacem*.

fingere non visa ; this accomplishment of the *scurra* is alluded to in *Serm.* II, 8, 83, *fictis rerum*, of the *scurra* Vibidius, and *Epist.* I, 15, 30, *opprobria fingere*, of the *scurra* Maenius. Another charge is that of being unable to keep a secret (*commissa tacere*). In *Epist.* I, 18, Horace urges Lollius to avoid the appearance of being a *scurra*, and says *commissumque teges*.³² Horace complains that he is criticized if he derides Rufillus for his perfumed breath and Gargonius for his hircine odor. The line is repeated from an earlier satire (I, 2, 27), and from the context one judges that these names are fictitious or that the men are insignificant. But the line is aptly chosen, for the hircine odor of Gargonius reminds us that Horace in the epistle already alluded to calls the *scurrae* noisome goats.³³ To deride a *scurra* who derides others without rebuke cannot be such very scurrilous behavior !³⁴

To the other group of charges, that the satirist is bent on injury, Horace replies that the person who pretends to be a good friend of a certain Petillius but wonders how the latter has managed to keep out of jail is far more venomous to his so-called friend. Horace promises that no such remarks shall sully his pages.³⁵

Although on account of the change from the third to the second person Horace might be understood to imply that two

³² Mart. Cap. IX, 997: (Satura) loquax . . . fandis tacenda farcinat.

³³ In Mart. I, 87, *pastilli* are used to perfume the breath the morning after a revel. This may be the case with Rufillus, a *scurra* overfond of his wine.

³⁴ See below, p. 124, for the strikingly similar situation in II, I, 21.

³⁵ In Kiessling's first edition, *absentem rodere* (81) is said to contrast with *praesentes convivas mordet* (86-91), *solutos captare risus* (83) with *ego si risi* (91-93), and *qui amicum non defendit* (82) with Petillius' so-called friend (94-103) — a sad commentary on philological method. In the third and fourth editions Heinze wisely omits the second pair, based on the superficial resemblance of *risus* and *risi*, but retains the first pair, though it causes even more strain to the eyes of the mind to try to see a contrast here. The use of *praesentes* in the note is misleading, for it does not occur in the text. *Amico* in verse 96 does, however, look back to *amicum* of verse 81. *Defendas* of verse 95 (used ironically) also looks back to *non defendit* of verse 82. Thus it becomes still clearer that verses 93-101 are an answer to verses 81-82. It may be a mere coincidence that Horace alludes to the *dura causa Petilli* in I, 10, 26, but one wonders whether he is not deliberately choosing this example (any at all would do) to show how differently he treats Petillius.

sorts of persons are guilty of the things charged, indiscriminate derision and malicious attack, it is clear that the *scurra* is responsible for the latter as well as the former. Lack of loyalty towards friends is characteristic of *scurrae* — in *Epist.* I, 18, 3 ff., the true friend is said to differ from the *scurra* as much as the *matrona* from the courtesan. The *scurra* is also called *infidus*. In contrast with this, Horace's own position on the matter of friendship is made clear in a number of places: in the whole of the third Satire, in I, 4, 135, in *Epist.* I, 18. Another phase of malice is to attack a person behind his back. The word used (*absentem*) calls to mind, as pointed out by Kiessling-Heinze, Maenius *absentem* Novium cum carperet in I, 3, 21, and (me) *vellicet absentem* Demetrius in I, 10, 79. The Maenius of the former passage is called a *scurra* by Horace. The Demetrius of the second passage is classed with Fannius (80), who is a *conviva* of Tigellius. As we saw above, Fannius is accused of personal attack (*laedere*). *Conviva* is again used in a slighting way in practically the sense of *scurra* in II, 8, 41. Since, then, the *scurra* is guilty of personal attack, there is an added point to II, I, 21–22. Trebatius is made to say that it is better to sing Caesar's praises than to make a personal attack (*laedere*) on Pantolabus the *scurra*. Horace is doing unto Pantolabus as the latter is doing unto others.⁸⁶

If the *scurra* is responsible for all these things, it may be asked why Horace adds the example of the "friend" of Petilius and why we should make two groups of the charges. The reason is that Horace's attitude towards the two groups is quite different. It may easily be inferred, as we have seen, that there are satirists who are guilty of all the charges, but Horace makes a distinction in his own case. He does not deny that he derides people, but his defense is that his fun-making is harmless.⁸⁷ But as to personal attack, he feels it

⁸⁶ See above, p. 123, for the very similar situation in I, 4. There it is one method (alleged purpose), namely laughter, which is commented on, here it is another method, attack.

⁸⁷ Thus the satire is in part a justification, not merely a "protest and a programme" (Hendrickson, *A.J.P.* XXI [1900], 121).

necessary to add the example of Petillius (in which fun-making is not involved) in order to prepare for his emphatic statement that malicious attacks on friends are not in his code (101-103).

What light have we, then, as to the purpose and method of Horatian satire? Fun-making is a legitimate part of satire, Horace tells us,³⁸ but is it the aim of satire, as was charged by Horace's opponent? The question is definitely answered in the passage immediately following (103-106): *Liberius si dixero quid . . . ut fugerem exemplis vitiorum quaeque notando*. The aim of satire is to reform character;³⁹ wit is the means, not the end. As Horace puts it tersely in *Serm.* I, I, 24, his aim is *ridentem dicere verum*. Too much wit is the mark of the *scurra*, as Cicero says.⁴⁰ Recognizing moral reform as the purpose of the satires, we see the significance of the charge in verse 79 that Horace not only rejoices in malicious attack, but that he is *pravus*. The point of Horace's reply is not only that he is free from that quality, but that it is the very thing against which he is trying to fight.⁴¹

But if wit is one of the means, what of the other, personal attack? This is, as we have seen, the most perplexing problem in the satire. Horace has revealed his attitude very gradually. The passage just discussed shows that he is willing to promise that he will make no malicious attacks on friends; and this carries with it the defense of an absent friend (81-82).⁴² But this is as far as he is willing to commit himself. He reserves the right to use the personal attack which was the characteristic feature of the Old Comedy and

³⁸ Cf. too *Serm.* I, 10, 7-8.

³⁹ Horace's claim that he is trying to reform only his own character is of course not to be taken too seriously—otherwise he would not have written at all.

⁴⁰ *Or.* 88: *nec nimis frequenti, ne scurrile sit*; similarly *de Or.* II, 244, 247.

⁴¹ The importance of *pravus* is noted in Kiessling-Heinze, but the explanation is, I think, slightly incorrect.

⁴² That this restriction on satire is a very important part of the Horatian plan and is a fitting climax for the poem is proved by the third Satire (probably written after the fourth). This is an earnest plea for tolerance of the faults, not of every one, but of friends. Horace does not allow himself to get away from this point. The words *amicus* and *amicitia* occur twelve times (cf. also *nobiscum vivit* in verse 5). See Lejay, p. 63.

Lucilius. At the same time, we see clearly that he intends to be more restrained in its use than they.

Horace attributes his method and purpose in satire to his father. Those who assume that Horace implies at the beginning of the satire his entire dependence on Lucilius and the Old Comedy are confronted with this inconsistency and have to explain the lack of explicitness at the beginning as due to the desire to avoid the appearance of such inconsistency. It is true that verbal inconsistency is avoided thereby, but the greater inconsistency in Horace's mind is not explained. Lejay says that Horace's father, without knowing it, used the method of the Old Comedy. But Horace feels that the restriction on personal attack, vague as he leaves it, and especially the purpose, marks his satire as different from that of Lucilius.⁴⁸

The language in the concluding passage, in which he illustrates his father's method, reminds one of verses 25 ff., where Horace says that all people have their weaknesses and consequently do not like satire. It is in fact the Horatian type of satire that is described in these lines. The opening words *quemvis media elige turba*, remind one of the method of Horace's father as described in the later passage. The types that follow are the subjects of Horatian satire, as examination will disclose:

Aut ob avaritiam aut misera ambitione laborat. — 26.

Avarice is the general theme of the first Satire, which may have been written before the fourth, though this coincidence would not be sufficient evidence. Ambition is touched on in I, 6, 23 ff., and the very phrase *misera ambitione* is found in I, 6, 129, in the same metrical position, though this satire is probably later than the fourth.

Hic nuptarum insanit amoribus, hic puerorum. — 27.

The former of the two vices is mentioned among the topics discussed by Horace's father in verses 113-114: *Ne sequerer*

⁴⁸ In I, 6, 65 ff., Horace says practically the same things about his father's share in his upbringing. There can be no question of the literal sincerity of his words in that passage.

moechas . . . 'deprensi non bella est fama Treboni,' and it is an important topic in the second Satire, which we know was written before the fourth, since a line of it (27) is repeated in I, 4, 92. Cf. especially I, 2, 41 ff., 64 ff., and for the words of Horace's father just quoted, I, 2, 133-134: *ne nummi pereant aut . . . fama. deprensi miserum est.* Horace's father also warns against the *meretrix*, another important figure in the second Satire (cf. especially I, 2, 47 ff., 58 ff.). The next subject in the earlier part of the satire is the expensive fad of collecting:

Hunc capit argenti splendor; stupet Albius aere. — 28.

Albius is mentioned by Horace's father also (109), and the repetition of the name is particularly intended by Horace to associate the two passages in the reader's mind.⁴⁴ The particular weakness indicated here is not satirized elsewhere in the *Satires*, though the extravagance which it indicates is touched on in the second Satire, and the similar weakness of being fascinated by paintings is mentioned in *Serm.* II, 7, 95.

Hic mutat merces . . .
 . . . quin per mala praecepta
 Fertur. — 29-31.

This is a special illustration of avarice and has been compared to I, I, 38:

cum te neque fervidus aestus
 Demoveat lucro, neque hiems, ignis, mare, ferrum.

The foregoing list is different (with one exception) from the short list of individuals attacked by the Old Comedy (I ff.). The difference is due to difference of purpose. The Old Comedy attacked those who were *famosi* (5), to bring them to justice. Horace attacks vices through individuals to bring about general moral reform.

Let us summarize briefly Horace's attitude thus far before passing to the tenth Satire. On one matter and one only he takes direct issue with Lucilius — that of composition. Here he is outspoken in his criticism. On the matter of publication

⁴⁴ Cf. my paper in *A.J.P.* XXXIII (1912), 160.

he attacks contemporary admirers of Lucilius and by implication Lucilius himself. He states clearly that his aim is moral reform. But on the matter of personal attack, though he makes some restrictions, he is not entirely clear, for two reasons perhaps: first, he had made personal attacks in his earlier work; second, he was not ready to say that he would never use personal attack of any sort. The first three points do, however, have a bearing on the fourth. Brevity tends, perhaps, to cut down the amount and especially the virulence of personal attack, a restricted audience means less notoriety for the victims of the satirist, and the moral purpose of Horace is some consolation to the timid.

We have suggested that in his comments on style Horace was bidding for the favor of influential men — such as Maecenas and Octavian. The purpose that he sets forth — moral reform — was, as it happens, one in which Octavian was much interested at a somewhat later period. Whether Horace was bidding for favor by these remarks also is not clear, but it is likely enough that it was his stylistic beliefs and his moral purpose that attracted Octavian's attention.

The tenth Satire is largely a dissertation on style, which I have tried to analyze in another paper.⁴⁵ But there are in the satire a few points bearing on the matter of personal attack. At the outset Horace states that more than wit is needed for good satire. Among other things, the satirist should make much use of mild jest and slight use of bitter invective. Here attention must be called to a point of the utmost importance: the use of invective is not to be confused with the free use of personal attack ascribed to Lucilius and the Old Comedy in the fourth Satire. Some of Horace's opponents seem to have confused the two, for they failed to understand that the Old Comedy could use personal satire without bitter invective (I, 10, 16 ff.).⁴⁶ In the matter of

⁴⁵ *Class. Phil.* x (1915), 270 ff. I hope to return to the subject in the near future.

⁴⁶ The reference to the Old Comedy must be intended as a reference to the statement at the beginning of the fourth Satire, inasmuch as the other two statements there made about Lucilius are repeated at the opening of the tenth Satire.

personal satire, however, the point at issue is, *who* shall be attacked, living or dead, prominent or obscure, criminals or profligates. That is the theme of the fourth Satire. But once the individual is selected for satire, the point at issue is, *how* shall he be attacked. Horace seems a little perturbed by the misunderstanding of his remarks, for the tone of the passage is this: "The Old Comedy — yes, the same which I said in my earlier satire used personal attack freely — stood by *this* and is to be imitated in *this* (note the emphatic repetition of *hoc*), that ridicule is better than invective. It may seem strange to persons who know nothing about the Old Comedy that personal satire and invective are not synonymous terms." The tenth Satire throws a little light on Horace's attitude towards the methods of satire. In the fourth, he says that if he does attack an individual, it will make no difference, for no one reads his writings. In the tenth, he says that if he does attack, his weapon will usually be harmless laughter, not sharp-pointed invective. But it will be noted that he reserves the right to use invective, as in the fourth Satire he reserves the right to attack individuals.

The first Satire of the second book, written several years later, serves a double purpose: first, to show why he cannot write epic; second, to explain more definitely his program. He opens the poem with the remark that some people think that he is too trenchant in satire, while others say that his verses are flat and are such as could be spun out by the thousand. It has been seen that the first class is the general public particularly addressed in 1, 4, and that the second class is the admirers of Lucilius attacked in the fourth and tenth Satires. It remains to add that the criticism of the latter (whether seriously meant or not) is a retort to Horace's charge of productivity against them and Lucilius (1, 4, 14, etc.).

Trebatius urges Horace to write about Augustus, a far better business than

tristi laedere versu

Pantolabum scurram Nomentanumque nepotem.

The last four words are a repetition of 1, 8, 11. Of great interest are *tristi laedere*. The former recalls *tristi* in 1, 10,

11 and, in fact, summarizes that poem, dealing as it does with the style of satire. In the same way *laedere* recalls 1, 4, 78 and summarizes the fourth Satire, dealing with the method of satire.⁴⁷ Trebatius charges Horace with the two things which Horace had previously denied for himself and attributed to others. Are the charges true? It is easy to see that there is no *tristitia* (invective) used against Pantolabus and Nomentanus in *Serm.* 1, 8; their names are merely mentioned. Likewise the attack on them cannot have been as personal as it seems. They are either fictitious characters, or dead, or insignificant, or notoriously bad.

Horace answers that he is fit for nothing except satire, and generously asserts his dependence on Lucilius. He had indicated this in 1, 4 and 1, 10, but he can afford to be more generous now. But he makes an important reservation introduced by the adversative *sed* (39).⁴⁸ We saw above that Horace does not expressly state his attitude toward free personal attack. He now states specifically that he will not attack any living person without cause. In other words, he will attack only those who attack him and those who have passed away.⁴⁹ His satire is a defensive weapon and it will remain sheathed, for he is safe from attack by robbers.⁵⁰

As a matter of fact, Horace's position on the matter of personal attack is that of an eclectic. He believes in a sparing use of the 'direct method' of the Old Comedy together with the 'enigmatic' method of the Middle Comedy and the generalizing method of the New Comedy. This comes out clearly in *Serm.* 11, 3, 11 ff., where Damasippus asks Horace what the use was of filling his trunk with the books of Eupolis, Plato, Menander, and Archilochus, if he is now going to abandon poetry (*virtute relicta*) and become an idler. The first three represent the Old, Middle, and New Comedy respectively, and these are Horace's models in satire; the

⁴⁷ Is it merely accident that even the inflectional form and metrical positions of *tristi* and *laedere* are repeated in *Serm.* 11, 1?

⁴⁸ I take *sed* to go back to *sequor* in verse 34. There has been much discussion of this point.

⁴⁹ See my papers in *A.J.P.* XXXIII, 160 and *C.P.* x, 273.

⁵⁰ The word *latronibus* carries one back in thought to *Serm.* 1, 4, 69.

fourth, Archilochus, is his model in the *Epoëes*, written contemporaneously with the *Satires*. For the Old Comedy as his model in satire, we have the statements of the fourth and tenth *Satires*; for comedy in general and the New Comedy in particular, we have the fact that Horace classes satire with comedy in the fourth *Satire* and cites a scene from the *vêa* as an example of comedy.

There appears then to be a considerable difference between the two books. In the first, Horace is reserved and rather vague, awaiting developments. By the time the second book was written, his thought and practice had become crystallized and he was prepared for a sharper definition.

All this of course has a wider significance than the mere interpretations suggested. The study seemed necessary as a preliminary to the study of Horace's sources in literary theory and especially his use of names in the *Satires*. We have seen what his doctrines were, it remains to be seen whence they were derived and what his practice was. And that leads inevitably to the study of the practice of other satirists, using the word satirist in the widest sense. The net result should be of considerable importance for the history of satire and especially for its interpretation, since the use of names is a fundamental feature of satire. There is a good deal in a name, after all — sometimes.

I have already studied two applications of Horace's theory. In *A.J.P.* xxxiii, 160, I argued that the Albius of *Serm.* i, 4, 28, was identical with the Albius of i, 4, 129, and that he was dead when Horace wrote. In *C.P.* x, 270, I tried to show that the Tigellius of the second and third *Satires* was identical with the Tigellius Hermogenes mentioned elsewhere in the *Satires*, and that he was dead when Horace wrote. The chief argument against this had been the address of Hermogenes in i, 10, 90, in the vocative case, as if he were alive. An exact and convincing parallel for this use is to be found in the first of the eight introductory lines to this same tenth *Satire*: Lucili, quam sis mendosus . . . pervincam. I failed to cite this example, not through oversight, but because I did

not wish to inject into the discussion the question of the genuineness of these lines. But I see now that it makes comparatively little difference whether Horace wrote these lines or not. The person who wrote them was either Horace or was putting himself in Horace's place, and well knew that Lucilius had died years before. I hope that this will prove the final fatal blow to the shadowy but persistent figure of Tigellius the Second.

To the wider study indicated above, I hope to return on other occasions.